

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, JUNE 1, 1854.

THE DEED DONE—HOW IT WAS DONE—A RECAPITULATION.

The Nebraska Bill, as it came from the Senate, only omitting the Clayton amendment, passed the House last night at eleven o'clock, by a vote of 113 to 100. How the thing was done, may be learned from the clear, condensed report of the *Intelligencer*, which we transfer to our columns. By whom it was done, may be ascertained by examining, first, the vote and, next, the motion to go into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union; secondly, those on the question of the final passage of the Bill, together with the analysis we have prepared of those votes.

Some of the gentlemen from the North, who voted in the negative on the final passage, did so chiefly for the purpose of retaining their position among the constituents, but on the various subordinate and preliminary motions, on which the minority struggled so manfully against the despotism of the majority, they either declined to vote, or acted with the majority, being unwilling to break with the Administration, or, really indifferent to the Bill. For the sake of enlightening the People on this point, we have classified the Northern members voting on the motion to go into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and on the final passage of the measure: they will see several names, recorded in the negative on the latter motion, recorded in the affirmative on the former!

This important Bill, containing, we believe, no fewer than forty sections, has been forced through, under the pressure of the day, without any opportunity having been afforded to consider it section by section, and subject it in its details to amendment.

Let us recapitulate.

Monday, May 31, it was taken up, by the unprecedented process of laying aside, one by one, resolution intervening bills on the calendar, many of them of the greatest practical importance.

Tuesday and Wednesday were devoted to one-hour speeches on a general subject of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise.

Thursday, in the beginning of the session, the policy of the gag was commenced, by a motion of Mr. Richardson to close debate the next day at twelve o'clock. This movement was deflected by the noble resistance of the minority, skillfully availing itself of the rules of the House, and after a struggle of thirty-six hours, the House adjourned.

Saturday it again met, but after a partial renewal of the contest, an adjournment took place till Monday, when the majority so far modified its gag-policy as to agree to a postponement of the special order (the Pacific Railway bill) till Wednesday week, and the closure of the debate on the Nebraska Bill the following Saturday at 12 o'clock; it being the general understanding that the consideration of the Bill should then proceed under the rule which provided for amendments to each section of any Bill, accompanied by five-minute speeches.

The gag-policy, even with this modification, was so offensive that the majority deemed it necessary to override the rule and precedents of the House to compel assent to it. It is right to say, that although the conduct of the Speaker throughout the protracted struggle has been generally fair and impartial, there were two instances in the proceedings, Monday, May 31, and Tuesday, June 1, in which his decisions, repugnant to precedents furnished by himself and his predecessor, Mr. Cobb, afforded signal advantages to the majority.

The first we noticed a few days ago, but, to complete our rapid review, we repeat it here. The House had suspended the rules. Mr. Richardson had submitted his resolution to close debate, and the question being put, he moved a call of the House. The motion was sustained, and the House adjourned.

The second, we present for the first time, contrasting the decision in this case, with two previous decisions by the same Speaker:

House of Representatives, April 15, 1852.—(Mr. Boyd, Speaker.)

The Committee on the bill of Mr. Jackson, of Georgia, with Mr. Hillyer's amendment, being before the House, the question being put, it was decided in the negative.

The question then recurring on the demand for the previous question, it was seconded.

And the question was then put, "Shall the main question be now put?"

It was decided in the affirmative.

Mr. Averett, of Virginia, moved that the resolution and amendment be laid on the table. Motion sustained, and decided in the negative, and the House again refused to lay on the table.

At this time (Congressional Globe, vol. 2, p. 589.) The Speaker said, "It is in order."

July 17, 1852.

Bill (No. 300) to admit railroad iron free of duty, was before the House, and Mr. Froge of W. Jones moved that the bill be laid on the table. The motion was decided in the negative.

The question recurring on the motion to refer to the Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Jones withdrew that motion, and moved it be committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and printed, and moved the previous question; pending the demand for which the House adjourned.

Mr. Dean moved that the bill be laid on the table. Motion sustained, and decided in the affirmative.—See *House Journal*, 1st Ser., 322 Cong.

House of Representatives, May 19, 1854.—(Mr. Boyd, Speaker.)

Mr. Richardson's resolution to close debate on the Nebraska Bill was before the House, when

Mr. Sage moved that it be laid on the table.

The motion was put, and decided in the negative.

The question recurring on recording the previous question.

A motion was made to adjourn.

Also, that when the House adjourns, it adjourn on Wednesday.

A call of the House was demanded and ruled out of order.

The question on adjourning over and adjourning were taken, and decided in the negative.

Another motion for a call of the House was made, and ruled out of order.

Also, another motion to adjourn over was refused as being out of order.

Mr. Washburn, of Maine, then moved that the resolution be laid on the table.

The Speaker decided that such a motion voted upon, should be reported as having been made, and reported as having been made.

The previous question having been recorded, Mr. Washburn renewed his motion to lay upon the table.

Decided by a vote of 100 to 100.

Speaker sustained by the majority.

See *Daily Globe*, May 30, 1854.

Had the character of Mr. Boyd been

more liberal, the result would have been

different.

The analysis is provided out, but will appear in

another column.

changed between the motions to lay on the table.

As to the case first cited, it is an exact precedent for Mr. Washburn's motion.

The Speaker made his decision on Mr. W's motion before objection by any member was interposed.

Precedent upon precedent, the almost daily practice of the House, warrants the motion to lay on the table, under the circumstances of this case.

If the Speaker had no rule, motions to lay on the table, adjourn, and adjourn over, might have been alternated without end.

We do not charge the Speaker with dishonesty or intentional unfairness, but it is impossible to explain these contradictory decisions, except on the supposition of a strong bias acting in favor of the majority.

But even this ruling would have left the minority still comparatively free. Hence, the majority subsequently proceeded to overrule the Speaker, and so to leave no ground for the opponents of the Bill to stand upon.

Mr. Meacham had appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

The Speaker, however, insisted on the point, calling the attention of the House to various precedents where similar motions had been entertained, after the previous question had been recorded, and the main question ordered to be put.

Mr. Meacham then appealed from the decision of the Speaker, that his motion to lay upon the table was out of order; Mr. Morgan had asked to be excused from voting on the appeal. Mr. Cleggman raised the point of order, that no motion to excuse should be entertained.

"The question was then put, and the tellers reported—aye 101, noes 2, a sufficient number."

"[Cries of "No quorum!"]

"The Chairman: No quorum is necessary to enable the Committee to rise."

"The Committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed his seat, the Chairman of the Committee (Mr. Old) reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had, according to order, laid the state of the Union generally under consideration, and particularly House Bill No. 236, to organize the Territories of Nebraska, Kansas, and had directed him to report the same back to the House, with a recommendation to strike out the enacting portion of the bill."

"We know not by what authority the report was inserted in parenthesis, the remark, 'a sufficient number.' It has no business there, for there was no quorum. 'A quorum is not necessary,' said the Chairman, 'to enable the Committee to rise.' True, but a quorum is necessary to enable the Committee to rise, and report its action to the House. Dr. Old declared that the Committee had directed him to report the bill back to the House, with a recommendation to strike out the enacting portion of it. The official record in the *Globe* shows that the Committee did no such thing; that the motion to rise and report its action, no quorum voted."

"From the beginning to the end of the transaction, the course of the Chairman was marked by usurpation of power, breach of privilege, and total disregard of the facts as they existed. But all this was necessary to consummate the system of gag-policy pre-determined and pre-arranged."

"Of the proceedings in the House, we shall now only remark, that they were characterized by the same despotism of the majority—the same flagrant disregard of the rights of the minority—as marked the conduct of the supporters of the bill during the last two weeks."

"The minority ought to expose the whole transaction, so as to vindicate their own action, show the lawlessness of their opponents, and prevent the People from being misled by a sophistry which will seek to hide the enormity of the act of the majority under a complicated mass of rules, precedents, and decisions."

ANALYSIS OF THE VOTE ON THE NEBRASKA BILL.

We gave the names of the affirmative and negative voters on the Nebraska Bill in the House on yesterday. The following table will be interesting, as it shows an analysis which will be readily comprehended.

On the passage of the bill (H. R. No. 236) to "organize the Territories of Nebraska and Kansas."

States.

Yea. Nay. Absent.

Whig No. of Whig Whig Whig

Maine 6 1 1

New Hampshire 6 1 1

THE NEW HYGIENIC FAMILY PHYSICIAN

A Medical Adviser and Ready Prescriber, with references to the Nature, Cause, Prevention, and Treatment, of Diseases, Accidents, and Casualties, of every kind; with a Glossary, Table of Contents, and Index. Illustrated with over Three Hundred Engravings and Colored Photographs.

By JESSE STEW, M. D. One large Vols. of 520 pages, substantially bound in library style. Published by FOWLER & WELLS, 386 Broadway, New York. This price per copy contains:

1. ANATOMICAL, PHYSIOLOGICAL, AND HYGIENIC DISSECTIONS, illustrated with numerous engravings.

2. THE NATURE OF DISEASES, Physiologically and Pathologically considered; Rules for management in the sick room.

3. A DESCRIPTION of the various Diseases of Prevention and Cure, on Hygienic principles.

4. THE EFFECTS OF POISONING, by Drugs, Injuries, Fractures, Dislocations, Scalds, Burns, Frost-biting, and other physical calamities. Illustrated.

5. THE DISEASES OF FETUS, with Advice and Directions for Home Treatment concerning Menstruation.

VI. THE WATER CURE PROCESSES fully illustrated and explained; Temperature of Baths, and the Philosophy of the Action of Water upon the Human System.

VII. THE EFFECTS OF AIR, EXERCISE, AND DIET, with especial reference to the treatment of Chronic Diseases.

VIII. THE DRUG PRACTICE contrasted with Hydropaths and Physiological Treatments.

IX. HYDROPATHIC REVALUATIONS—their Location, Formation, and Right Management.

THE NEW HYDROPATHIC FAMILY PHYSICIAN is the most elaborate and complete popular work on the subject. Every family should have a copy. Price, delivered free, or with postage prepaid by mail, only \$2.50. The amount may be enclosed in a letter and directed to **HOWLAND & WELLS**

No 38 Broadway, New York.
Agents-wanted in all the States. May 29-231v

Lays of Liberty;
OR,
VERSES FOR THE TIMES.

THIS is the title of a small volume of choice Anti-Slavery verses, collected from various sources, and put into one little volume of fifty-four pages, handsomely printed, and bound in cloth. Published by
REILA MARSH,
May 29. No. 9 Franklin street, Boston.

THE CONFLICT OF AGES!

BY DR. EDWARD KEECHER.

This Remarkable Work has reached its Fifth Edition, in the brief space of Four Months! A success unprecedented in Theological Publications!

AN impression has already been produced by this masterly treatise, the most profound, wide reaching, and permanent.

It is perfectly manifest to all competent observers, that we are upon the eve of a theological discussion, the most comprehensive, radical, and portentous, the world has ever seen. To this discussion this book leads the way, with a momentum irresistible. There is not a question in Theology which is not destined to come up for a new and thorough settlement in the light of this final development.

All those who have Theological doubts and difficulties will find much to interest them in this work after reading it. Those who have no doubts, but wish to know more fully the history of opinions in the past, and to keep pace with the progress of modern thought, will also find it very interesting if they neglect to make themselves familiar with this book. It contains the seeds of the most important questions which are now agitated. The recognition of this work by the Theological Faculty of the University of Bonn has been generally declining to accept his conclusion, they do it quite opposite and contradictory grounds. One-half of the faculty, however, still adhere to the old views, and the argument, and denies the minor. The other half even goes further, and denies the major. And as they are probably right, we must conclude that the first was wrong in their negative, the work has received a Virgilian burial.

As regards the ability of the work, and its claim on the attention of all, the following extracts may

From the Princeton Repository—Old School Repository:

"It is characterized by great ability, by an earnestness of purpose, by a thoroughness of research, by a special interest for us. We hail it as AN ALMIGHTY HELP-MATE IN OUR STUDIES OF THE HISTORY OF THEOLOGY AND THE DOCTRINE OF PRE-EXISTENCE."

From the Universitäts Quarterly and General Review:

We have the novel spectacle of a man clinging with a masterly grasp to all the fundamentals of Orthodoxy, * * * yet dealing it a blow beneath which it reels.

It would be difficult to find within the limits of a hundred pages any treatise or essay that can compare in importance with this analysis (B. iv) of Orthodox doctrines. Dr. Beecher has struck upon the right principle in his theory of typical interpretation, in the fifth of Romans.

From the Methodist Quarterly Review.

The profoundest questions of Theology are taking

is an earnest exposition of the great problem of Theology, by an earnest man, who feels and thinks

This volume is the first original investigation
Every page of it bears the impress of a vigorous
for their itself. * * * The book will be read
of truth will come as well as much which
greater labor which it calls for some addition to the
The same problem advises the preparation of an
From the Baptist Christian Review, Hartford.
The problem proposed for discussion is the most
minal. * * * He considers, in detail, all the
tempted in all ages; and relations that have been at-
tained, * * * and rejects the whole without hesi-
tation.
Christian Examiner, (Unitarian).
We should tremble on the patience of our readers,
yet we cannot refrain from saying that this work
starting, yes, the appalling exhibition, which Dr. H.
has made of Unitarian System.
Boston Convention.
If Unitarians and Unitariness will read the work
then of the slippery road, powerful tendency to draw
Christian Examiner.
How much more would they wish to come to the
the Orthodox may be allowed to transpire publicly,
we cannot say; for policy may shut down; but
question," Men and brethren, what shall we do?"

From the Boston Congregationalist.
Pugh! "Heaven, the sky is falling." "Who told you, Chicklick?" "I went down into the garden, and a currant fell on my head!"
From the Christian Examiner.
The word "Pugh" is easily spoken. We consider the book as so manifestly destined to re-open, in the most effective way, our whole controversy, and, in the long result, to win such a triumph for our general views of the doctrines of the Bible, that we would give our vote to a proposition that one-half the whole race of *After* shall be

are about to raise for the circulation of their books, should be spent in the dissemination of this volume.

From the Unitarian Monthly Religious Magazine, Edited by Rev. Mr. Haughton.

Dr. Beecher's theory acts with most logical force against those who would place no limit upon Unitarianism. Those apostles of lax notions who are treating man's sinfulness and need of regeneration, who have hastened to greet this volume as an ally to their cause, will be subject to a disappointment. * * * Whoever undertakes to answer the general argument, except perhaps from the ground of extreme Polagianism, will find room for the exercise of his best faculties.

The fate of this book will be singular. Sold, read

admired, discussed, abused, plundered from, laughed at, to fulfill a measure as the most ambitious writer could desire.

National Era.

This work has caused a great commotion among the D. D.'s in our land. It merits their attention.

N. Y. Tribune.

The most significant work on Theology which has appeared of late.

In many respects, this volume is one of the most curious as well as one of the most suggestive volumes of the age.

Philadelphia Presbyterian Quarterly, New School.
Able it unquestionably is.
Westminster Review, England.
The "Conflict of Ages" is, in effect, a protest
against Calvinism by one of the leading Calvinistic
divines of New England.
Boston Congregationalist.
A very unsafe book for heresiarchs to put into
the hands of either Universalist or Unitarian of real

and manly mind, accustomed to deep and serious thought. Whatever else he may be or may not be, he will never be either an ancient Socinian or a modern Universalist.

The New Englander.

The book itself, in its compressed thought, its vigorous diction, and admirable arrangement of topics, is a valuable illustration of the advantages which are gained by patient labor. * * * We have never yet seen this sketch surpassed (Book iv. Historical Outline) for its breadth and accuracy, by any history

of doctrine; and we think that few pages have been penned in any department of literature, by American authors, which deserve to be read more attentively, or which display such extensive and thorough learning, or such clear, candid, and accurate statements, in the briefest compass. The careful perusal of the Fourth Book would convey more profitable information in Ecclesiastical History, than is acquired by many students in their entire theological course.

Similar testimonials could be multiplied indefinitely. Indeed the amount of matter already printed,

in the form of reviews, criticisms, replies, &c. would form several volumes of the size of the book itself. Its publication must constitute an era in the world's thought. Whoever does not wish to be behind the age must read the "Conflict of Ages."

PHILLIPS, SAMPSON, & CO.,
Publishers.

* * * For sale by all Booksellers. May 26.

A. ARNOLD, PATENT AGENT,
CONTINUES the business of furnishing Drawings,
Specifications, Caveats, Conveyances, and procuring
Patents. He attends to all business usually re-
lating to the transaction with the Patent Office.

Seventh street, oppo
Single copy . . .
Three copies . . .
Five copies . . .
Daily National B
P

forwarded by Express, and letters containing a sum of five dollars, are promptly attended to. Persons writing from a distance should give their town, county, and State, legibly.

Refer to Hon. Thomas J. Rusk, Hon. C. P. James, and Hon. P. Allen, U. S. Senate.

Dec. —6m

Z. C. ROBBINS,
Mechanical Engineer and Solicitor of Patents,
Washington, D. C.,

WILL make Examinations at the Patent Office, prepare Drawings and Specifications, and prosecute Applications for Patents, both in the United States and foreign countries.

Applications for patents which have been rejected at the Patent Office, he will, when required, argue before the Commissioner of Patents, or before the Appellate Court, in which line of practice he has been successful in procuring a great number of very valuable patents.

He will prepare new specifications and claims for

ness of the paper on
dressed to G. BAILEY

WASHINGTON

For
LEON

re-issue of patents previously granted on imperfect descriptions and claims.

Applications for extensions of patents, either at the Patent Office, or before Congress, he will also vigorously prosecute.

Also, superintend the taking of testimony to be used in conflicting applications before the Patent Office, or to be read in court.

In all cases of litigation on the subject of patents, he will prepare the cases for the legal profession, examine the merits of the cases, and defend the rights of his clients.

A ROMANCE

By the author of "*The Embassy*," "*Lucretia*," &c.

The Brethren

He will also give opinions and advice as to the value and validity of patents, and may be consulted in cases of infringements of patents, and all other matters pertaining to the patent laws and practices in the United States and Europe.

Also, prepare assignments, and all other papers required for securing or transferring patent property.

Having been ten years in the constant practice of

profession in this city, and having free access to the models and records in the Patent Office, as well as to his library, and the "Congressional Library," he flatters himself that he can in all cases give perfect satisfaction to those who may wish to do business in his hands.

March 29--
Office on F street, opposite the Patent Office.

S. F. CHASE.	F. HALL.
CHASE & BALL, Attorneys and Counsellors at Law, Cincinnati, Ohio, practice in the State	

of Ohio, in the Circuit and District Courts of the United States in Ohio, and in the Supreme Court of the United States at Washington. Jan. 5

BOOK AGENTS WANTED,

TO circulate in every county in the Union some of the most *rapid selling*, popular, and beautifully illustrated subscription books. A small capital required. Apply to **HENRY HOOKS, 111 Main street, Cincinnati, Ohio.** Feb. 16.

THE PIANO AND MUSIC ESTABLISHMENT OF
ICE-ACE WATERS,
No. 333 Broadway, New York.

THE best and most improved Pianos and Melodions in the world. T. G. Gilbey & Co.'s World's Fair Premium Pianos, with or without the Zolian, and with iron frames and circular reeds. The merits of these instruments are too well known to need further commendation. Gilbey's Boudoir Pianos, an elegant instrument for small rooms. Hallett & Co.,

Men's Pianos, of the established firm of Hallet & Co. Mr. W. being sole agent for all the above Piano. We can offer them lower than any other house in the United States. Horace Waters's Pianos, manufactured expressly for him, having great power of tone and elasticity of touch. Pianos of other make. In word, 333 Broadway is one of the largest depots for Pianos in the world, affording an opportunity for selections not to be found anywhere else on the American continent. Second hand Pianos at great bargain. Priced from \$50 to \$125.

MELODIONS.
Goodman & Baldwin's Patent Organ Melodions, with five kinds of keys—a sweet and powerful instrument. Prices from \$75 to \$200.
S. D. & H. W. Smith's well-known and justly celebrated Melodions. Prices from \$50 to \$150.
☞ The above makes are the only ones tuned in the equal temperament. ☞ Melodions of other makes, of all styles and prices.
Martin's unrivalled Guitars, from \$25 to \$50. Pianos.

nna, from \$5 to \$25. Accordions, from \$2 to \$20.
 Viollins, from \$3 to \$25. Flutes, from \$5 to \$10.
 Brass instruments, and others, of all kinds.
 Dealers supplied with the above Pianos and Melodions at factory prices.

MUSIC.

This list comprises the products of the great masters of both the American and European continents, and is receiving constant additions by an extensive publication of the choice and popular pieces of the

day. Dealers in Music Teachers of Seminaries and Academies, wishing to purchase any music published in the United States, or make arrangements for continued supplies of Mr. Waton's new issues, will find it greatly to their interest to call or forward their orders. Music sent to any part of the United States postage free.

May 22.

IMPORTANT TO YOUNG MEN.

OFFER for sale upwards of thirty different Bibles, many of which have been sold the past year

for five dollars a piece and the whole comprising many different ways to make money. In the sale of one of the articles alone, I have known young men the past year to make from five to twelve dollars per day; and in the manufacture and sale of any one of the articles, no young man of energy and ability can fail to make money. Address E. BOWMAN, Boston, Mass., enclosing one dollar, and the whole amount. Receipts will be forwarded by mail. No letter taken from the office unless prepaid. March 1.

ATTENTION!
SOLDIERS who served in the various wars, and sailors, or their widows or heirs, to whom arrears of pay, extra pay, bounty land, pensions, &c. may be due, may find it to their advantage to have their claims investigated. Address
A. M. GANGEWER,
 Attorney and Agent, Washington, D. C.
 Bounty-land warrants bought and sold.

WILL attend to the securing and collecting of claims, and all other business intrusted to his care, in the counties of Wayne, Randolph, Henry, Union, and Fayette, and in the Supreme and Federal Courts at Indianapolis. Dec. 22.

CLEVELAND WATER CURE ESTABLISHMENT.

The number of patients treated at the Establishment has been on the increase from year to year, for the last six years, until the last season, when the demands of the public have far exceeded our power to accommodate them. The increasing rapidity and proportion of cures, from year to year, induces the subscriber to believe that his enlarged experience and opportunities for treatment give facilities to the invalid rarely equalled.

Diseases peculiar to females are treated with a success and rapidity of cure believed to be surpassed by none. [May 22] T. T. SEELYE, M. D.

THE LADIES' WREATH AND PARLOR ANNUAL.
Now is the Time to Subscribe.

THE tenth volume of this well-known and popular monthly commences with the May number, 1884. Notwithstanding the entire destruction of their re-

establishment by the recent fire, subjecting them to a loss of over twenty thousand dollars, the publishers have made arrangements to continue their publication on a liberal and extended scale, determined that, if possible, in all those qualities which have so long rendered this the best of the Dollar Magazine.

The Literary matter will be entirely original, from the ablest and purest writers in the country. Everything of an immoral or irreligious character will be carefully excluded. We intend to present the public

with a work which all blend interestingly with instruction, and not only captivate the taste, but also elevate the thoughts and improve the heart.

Each number will contain a fine steel engraving, and a beautifully colored large-plate, also engraved on steel, and thirty-two large 6vo pages, printed on fine paper; the May number will be an attractive wide-page, making, in all, a volume of an attractive volume of 424 pp. All who are interested in a *pure family literature* and are willing to assist in furthering the best native talent, are invited to become

these did not see jaw, or the debt spoke with turp and was evident his colleagues.

To the right of a well-known a turns sung the praises of the

scribers, and to aid in its circulation.

Notwithstanding the increased cost of the work by the advance in the price of paper, printing, &c., we will continue to furnish it at the exceeding low terms of

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR IN ADVANCE.	
10 copies, 1 year	\$5
10 copies, 1 year	\$5
10 copies, 1 year	\$5
10 copies, 1 year	\$5

Specimen numbers furnished those desiring to form clubs. Agents wanted in all parts of the country; to those furnishing proper testimonials of character, the most liberal terms will be given. Address,

Charles, of the U. S. Co., but who, of the last, the faithful only to the Revolution had an ambition to be favored by his great, and a well-representative of

IMPORTANT TO THE BLIND.
R. KNAPP, Oculist, at No. 140 Main street, Boston. Has the latest and best method of curing the Blind with

12th, New York, reported having been cured of the chemical vapors, normally applied. This new method, causing *no pain*, is as once remarkable and successful. Several forms of blindness are removed by this treatment, that heretofore have been incurable.

March 27.

S. S. WILLIAMS,
Attorney and Counsellor at Law, Washington City.

PRACTICES in the Courts of the District of Columbia, and before the Departments of the Government.

NED DOW'S
ONE HUNDRED WAYS TO MAKE MONEY,
consisting of new discoveries, valuable information,
and 100 Receipts, by which persons have cleared
from three to ten dollars a day the past year, and
now can all fail to make money. It is suitable for every
station in life, whether for travelling or a permanent
locality, and something every mechanic, tradesman,
farmer, or householder should have. Price 25 cents.

and druggist, should say. Upon the receipt of the
dollar, post paid, the above will be forwarded. Ad-
dress
March 15.
M. EDWARD DOW,
Boston, Massachusetts.